



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

mf

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/938,706

09/26/97

KUBOMURA

K

1221290HJS

LM01/0202

STAAS AND HALSEY
700 ELEVENTH STREET N W
SUITE 500
WASHINGTON DC 20001

EXAMINER

PAULA, C

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2776

DATE MAILED:

02/02/00 *9*

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

08/938,706

Applicant(s)

Kubomura et al.

Examiner

Cesar B. Paula

Group Art Unit

2776

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Oct 28, 1999

☒ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1035 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claim

☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☒ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☒ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☒ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

— SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES —

Art Unit: 2776

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on 10/28/1999.

This action is made final.

2. In the amendment claims 16-26 have been added. Claims 1-26 are pending in the case.
Claims 1, 4, 7, 9, and 11-15 are independent claims.

Specification

3. The title of the invention, and the minor informalities have been corrected appropriately, therefore the objections to the specification have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Appropriate corrections were made to claims 2-3, 5-6, 10, 14, and 15-26; therefore, the 112 first and/or second paragraph rejections have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Art Unit: 2776

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-26 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Warnock et al. (Pat.# 5,634,064).

Regarding independent claim 1, Warnock et al disclose "an electronic document viewer..." (col. 2, ln. 38), "...when in the article view mode, at least a portion of a selected article is displayed on the computer screen in an enhanced article view which facilitates the comfortable reading of the document..." (col. 2, ln. 48-52), "...the displaying step causes the selected portion of the article to be automatically sized within the article view area to enhance its readability..." (col. 3, ln. 17-19), and "an electronic document typically has information content (such as text, graphics, and pictures)....." (col. 1, ln. 26-28). Warnock et al show that an article with characters and pictures could be enlarged "sized" to facilitate the reading of it.

Regarding independent claim 1, Warnock et al fail to explicitly disclose *detection means for detecting whether a request for opening said intended area is issued*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have had a *detection means*, because Warnock et al disclose "...a computer implemented process determines a desired view mode..... when in the article view mode, at least a portion of the selected article is displayed....." (col. 2, ln. 43-50). According to Warnock et al, an article could be viewed "sized" or zoomed for better readability using the article mode (col. 3, ln. 18, and 27-30), hence a means for detecting the article mode would be needed to accomplish the desired view.

Art Unit: 2776

Moreover, as the examiner understands claim 1, Warnock et al fail to explicitly disclose *determining means for determining a second magnification rate*..... However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have had a *determining means to determine a second magnification rate*, because Warnock et al disclose "...the displaying step causes the selected portion of the article to be automatically sized within the article view area to enhance its readability. This is often referred to as " zoom....." (col. 3, ln. 17-20). According to Warnock et al, an article could be viewed "sized" or zoomed for better readability, hence a means for determining the enlargement of the article would be needed to accomplish the desired enhancement.

Moreover, Warnock et al fail to explicitly disclose *enlarged display means* However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have had a *enlarged display means*, because Warnock et al disclose "Furthermore, selected portions of the article are automatically panned and zoomed to fit a viewing area or window" (col. 3, ln. 17-20). According to Warnock et al, an article could be displayed "sized" or "zoomed" for better readability, hence a means for displaying the enlargement of the article would be needed to accomplish the desired enhancement.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Warnock et al disclose "the article can be selected by a variety of modes including.....selecting a visible portion of an article from a document being displayed in the normal view. Preferably the displaying step causes the selected portion of the

Art Unit: 2776

article....."zoom"...." (col. 3, ln. 17-20). Warnock et al disclose switching from normal view to article view mode (enlarged view)--*correcting the magnification rate upward*.

Moreover, Warnock et al disclose "when in normal view mode, the document viewer displays at least a portion of the documentthat has the formatting and appearance intended by the publisher....." (col. 2, ln. 45-48).

Furthermore, Warnock et al disclose "when it is desired by the user to leave the article view mode, process control.....which determines whether the original view should be restored....." (col. 10, ln. 4-7). Warnock et al disclose switching from article view mode (enlarged view) to normal view --*correcting the magnification rate downward*.

Regarding dependent claim 3, Warnock et al disclose "....furthermore, selected portions of the article are automatically panned and zoomed to fit a viewing area or window....." (col. 3, ln. 27-30). Warnock et al describe fitting the zoomed characters--article--in an available area or window. This had to take into consideration the intended area size and the whole screen.

Furthermore, Warnock et al disclose " furthermore, selected portions of the article are automatically panned and zoomed to fit a viewing area or window " (col. 3, ln. 17-20) hence the display of the intended area in the enlarged form.

Regarding independent claim 4, Warnock et al disclose " an electronic document viewer...." (col. 2, ln. 38), "when in the article view mode, at least a portion of a selected article is displayed on the computer screen in an enhanced article view which facilitates the comfortable reading of the document..." (col. 2, ln. 48-52), "...the displaying step causes the

Art Unit: 2776

selected portion of the article to be automatically sized within the article view area to enhance its readability..." (col. 3, ln. 17-19), and "An electronic document typically has information content (such as text, graphics, and pictures)....." (col. 1, ln. 26-28). Warnock et al show that an article with characters and pictures could be enlarged "sized" to facilitate the reading of it.

Regarding independent claim 4, Warnock et al fail to explicitly disclose *detection means for detecting whether a request for opening said intended area is issued*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have had a *detection means*, because Warnock et al disclose "...a computer implemented process determines a desired view mode..... when in the article view mode, at least a portion of the selected article is displayed....." (col. 2, ln. 43-50). According to Warnock et al, an article could be viewed "sized" or zoomed for better readability using the article mode (col. 3, ln. 18, and 27-30), hence a means for detecting the article mode would be needed to accomplish the desired view.

Moreover, as the examiner understands claim 4, Warnock et al fail to explicitly disclose *determining means for determining a second magnification rate*..... However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have had a *determining means to determine a second magnification rate*, because Warnock et al disclose "...the displaying step causes the selected portion of the article to be automatically sized within the article view area to enhance its readability. This is often referred to as "zoom....." (col. 3, ln. 17-20). According to Warnock et al, an article could be viewed "sized" or zoomed for better

Art Unit: 2776

readability, hence a means for determining the enlargement of the article would be needed to accomplish the desired enhancement.

Moreover, Warnock et al fail to explicitly disclose *enlarged display means*
However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have had a *enlarged display means*, because Warnock et al disclose “ furthermore, selected portions of the article are automatically panned and zoomed to fit a viewing area or window” (col. 3, ln. 17-20). According to Warnock et al, an article could be displayed “sized” or “zoomed” for better readability, hence a means for displaying the enlargement of the article would be needed to accomplish the desired enhancement.

Regarding dependent claim 5, as examiner understand the claim, Warnock et al disclose “ furthermore, selected portions of the article are automatically panned and zoomed to fit a viewing area or window” (col. 3, ln. 17-20). According to Warnock et al, an enlarged article could be adjusted to fit to a specific window or screen size.

Regarding dependent claim 6, Warnock et al fail to disclose *said determining means calculates said magnification ratethe character displayed....first magnification rate is equal to the size of the character displayed in the intended area* . However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have had a *such determining means*, because Warnock et al disclose. “when in normal view mode, the document viewer displays at least a portion of the documentthat has the formatting and appearance

Art Unit: 2776

intended by the publisher....." (col. 2, ln. 45-48). This means that if the user was to open two windows in the normal view mode the two windows would have the same character size.

Furthermore, Warnock et al disclose "furthermore, selected portions of the article are automatically panned and zoomed to fit a viewing area or window" (col. 3, ln. 17-20) hence the display of a character in the enlarged form.

Regarding independent claim 7, Warnock et al fail to explicitly disclose *detection means for detecting whether a request for opening said intended area is issued*. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have had a *detection means*, because Warnock et al disclose "...a computer implemented process determines a desired view mode..... when in the article view mode, at least a portion of the selected article is displayed....." (col. 2, ln. 43-50). According to Warnock et al, an article could be viewed "sized" or zoomed for better readability using the article mode (col. 3, ln. 18, and 27-30), hence a means for detecting the article mode would be needed to accomplish the desired view.

Moreover, regarding claim 7, Warnock et al fail to explicitly disclose *determining means for determining a second magnification rate.....* However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have had a *determining means to determine a second magnification rate*, because Warnock et al disclose "...the displaying step causes the selected portion of the article to be automatically sized within the article view area to enhance its readability. This is often referred to as " zoom....." (col. 3, ln. 17-20). According to

Art Unit: 2776

Warnock et al, an article could be viewed "sized" or zoomed for better readability, hence a means for determining the enlargement of the article would be needed to accomplish the desired enhancement.

Moreover, Warnock et al fail to explicitly disclose *enlarged display means*
However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have had a *enlarged display means*, because Warnock et al disclose furthermore, selected portions of the article are automatically panned and zoomed to fit a viewing area or window " (col. 3, ln. 17-20). According to Warnock et al, an article could be displayed "sized" or "zoomed" for better readability, hence a means for displaying the enlargement of the article would be needed to accomplish the desired enhancement.

Regarding dependent claim 8, as examiner understand the claim, Warnock et al disclose "furthermore, selected portions of the article are automatically panned and zoomed to fit a viewing area or window " (col. 3, ln. 17-20). According to Warnock et al, an enlarged article could be adjusted to fit to a specific window or screen size.

Regarding independent claim 9, as examiner understand the claim, Warnock et al disclose "....the other type of scroll is an article scroll.....to display a new portion of the article.....this new portion of the article is automatically panned and zoomed to fit within the article view area of the window....." (col. 9, ln. 46-55).

Moreover, Warnock et al fail to disclose *detection means for detecting whether.....said scrolling means has reached a displayable state and prohibition means for prohibiting said*

Art Unit: 2776

intended window from being further scrolled.....the trailing endis in a displayable state.

However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have had such *scrolling means*, because this type of scrolling was well known in the art at the time of the invention.

Regarding dependent claim 10, as far as the examiner can determine from this claim, Warnock et al fail to disclose *memory means for storing the coordinates of at least.....* and *restoration means for restoring and displayingthe display state of said intended area.*

However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have had such *memory and restoration means*, because Warnock et al teach “memory 14.....includes number of types of memory storage devices which can provide memory storage locations accessible by the digital processor.....” (col. 4, ln. 19-34) and “....when it is desired by the user to leave the article view mode, process control.....determines whether the original view should be restored.

Claims 11-15 are directed towards a recording medium readable by a computer for performing the functions of the apparatus in claims 1, 4, 7, 9, and 10 respectively and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 16-23 are directed towards the same limitations of claim 10, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Claims 24-26 are directed towards recording medium readable by a computer for performing the functions of the apparatus in claim 10, and are rejected under the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2776

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 10/28/1999 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicants submit “therefore Warnock et al. Fails to disclose a second magnification rate. Further, it would not be obvious to combine a second magnification rate with Warnock et al.....” (page 29, pgph 2). The Examiner does not agree with this assessment of Warnock et al, because as was pointed out in the rejection of claim 1 on page 10, Warnock et al disclose that “Furthermore, selected portions of the article are automatically panned and zoomed to fit a viewing area or window.....” (col. 3, ln. 17-20). This quote of Warnock et al points out that a page of a document displayed on the screen in a normal view mode—first magnification rate—could be displayed in a zoomed or article mode—second magnification rate--, thereby providing the user with two separate “views” or magnification rates.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Hiraike (Pat. # 6,016,155).
1. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 2776

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


I. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (703) 306-5543. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Razavi, can be reached on (703) 305-4713. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day. The formal and informal fax phone numbers for this Group are (703) 308-9051 and 308-5403 respectively.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

cbp

01/27/00


STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER